

TOWN MEETING



March 18, 1956
Vol. 21, No. 47
914th Broadcast

"DO WE HAVE EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP IN FOREIGN POLICY?"

Speakers:

REP. JOHN M. VORYS

REP. ALBERT P. MORANO

REP. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

REP. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

Moderator:

DR. SHEPHERD L. WITMAN



Broadcast from
Station WMAL
Washington, D. C.

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast Sundays, ABC Network, 8 to 9 p.m., Eastern Time

"DO WE HAVE EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP IN FOREIGN POLICY?"

DR. WITMAN: Good evening, friends. It is no secret that tonight's subject has been causing some people concern during recent weeks. There are two sides and, therefore, two answers to the question: DO WE HAVE EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP IN OUR FOREIGN POLICY? But there is no doubt that each of us will have to decide on one of these answers.

If there has been confusion and inconsistency in our policies, as some charge, or, if we have put the Soviet on the run, as some claim, we better find out which it is, as quickly as possible. So tonight we will have a very frank discussion of this matter to help you make your own decisions.

To help you do that, we have with us four members of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. The first of these four speakers who will present their position on this timely subject is Mr. John M. Vorys who has been a member of Congress for almost 20 years. He has done his major work with the House Foreign Affairs Committee and stands from the State of Ohio. He was floor manager in the House for the Marshall Plan and later became a member of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy. He also served with the United States delegation to the 6th session of the United Nations in 1951. We are delighted to have you here, and to hear from you, Representative Vorys!

REP. VORYS: Dr. Witman and friends, we have peace and prosperity for the first time in 25 years. That didn't just happen. It is the result of effective leadership in a world torn with problems, poverty, tension and strife. Our leaders in foreign policy are the best trained team we have ever had, President Eisenhower with 15 years of experience in leadership, military and civil, in handling allies and enemies in peace and war; Secretary of State Dulles has training and experience in foreign affairs going back to 1919. In this Democrat Congress, leadership in foreign policy is furnished by the two powerful committee chairmen, Senator George in the Senate, Congressman Richards in the House, chairman of our committee. Based on personal experience, character and ability, that is pretty strong leadership -- executive and legislative, bipartisan in personnel and policy -- and it has been effective.

Here are some recent results of that leadership in the Cold War struggle. In Europe, Germany has joined NATO -- Austria has gained its independence -- Western-European Union was formed. In the Pacific, Japan, Korea and China have joined us in mutual security treaties. In Southeast Asia, SEATO, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization was created. It is now a going concern. In the Middle East, the Northern Tier concept has erected a defense line for 2500 miles along Russia's southern borders. In Latin America a Communist government was overthrown in Guatemala. The President's Atoms for Peace Program, that is, Blue Sky proposals for disarmament, have given us the initiative in the peace front and utterly destroyed the war-monger charge against us, built up by the Communists. The Soviets have temporarily abandoned their intolerance and violence and are emphasizing now trade and economic aid. We've been emphasizing these for ten years. As Secretary Dulles says, if imitation is the sincerest flattery, we should be flattered rather than fearful that the Soviets are following our lead.

We still have plenty of problems -- plenty of trouble -- plenty of criticism, but I see no agreement on who could do it better or how to do it better. Thank God we have effective leadership in personnel, practice and performance for these critical times.

DR. WITMAN: Let's hear next from Harrison A. Williams, Jr. New Jersey Democrat Harrison Williams is a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, too. In the previous Congress he travelled throughout Europe to study United States economic and assistance programs and information services for the Government Operations Committee. Upon his return, he initiated improvements in both our technical assistance and overseas investment programs. Mr. Harrison Williams, Jr.

The "Town Meeting Bulletin" is published weekly by The Town Hall, Inc. The text is compiled from a recording of the actual broadcast and the publisher is not responsible for the statements of the speakers. Subscription rates: \$5.00 per year; six months, \$3.00. Single copies, 25¢. Quantity rates on request. Address: "Town Meeting Bulletin," New York 36, New York.

REP. WILLIAMS: Ladies and gentlemen, as we look around the world today, nowhere do we see the stability that augurs well for world peace. This is not necessarily a condemnation of the administration's foreign policy, but as I see it, it is a statement of plain fact. In the last several years NATO has deteriorated seriously. The plan to bring German forces into NATO has hardly progressed and the position of the West's strongest ally, Chancellor Adenauer, has weakened. In France the trend is toward extremism and the French have diverted energies and forces from NATO to North Africa. In Iceland, where we have a highly strategic air base, there has been a rapid growth of internal Communist strength. Britain and Greece, so recently comrades-in-arms, are bitterly divided over Cyprus. As to Asia, half of Vietnam was bartered away at Geneva and the other half is in mortal peril. If an election were held today, the Communists would take all of Vietnam. India has become more hostile to us. The Baghdad Pact is in serious trouble. Conflicts between Arab and Arab, and between the Arab world and Israel become hotter every day. Also, the beginnings of serious Communist efforts at infiltration can be seen in Africa. All over the world, including South America, the Soviets are making lucrative trade and economic arrangements, sending in their personnel as keys to expansion of Soviet influence.

Much of what is happening is the outgrowth of vast social and economic upheavals to overthrow colonialism and to express the kind of ardent nationalism that we experienced at the birth of our nation. Many of the forces let loose are, it is true, independent of our policies and the administration cannot entirely be called to task. Unfortunately, however, our policies have not been adapted quickly enough to the changing situation. Let's remember that victory for democracy is not inevitable and civilizations have fallen from overconfidence. Actions by both the administration and the Congress must be based on the facts of life in today's world -- not on campaign slogans and politically expedient attitudes.

I don't think we can afford to gamble that the Communists will not meet with any major successes before next November. Neither the Republican Administration nor the Democratic controlled Congress can, in my opinion, afford to base its foreign policy actions on political expediency.

From a Constitutional and practical point of view the President must, of course, be the leader in the field of foreign policy but it is the responsibility of the opposition party, particularly since we do control the Congress, to do more than just criticize. We must suggest alternative means of dealing with some of the problems facing us if we are to meet our test of responsibility. If the bipartisan umbrella means cooperation in policy formulation as well as in approval of administration proposals by the Democratic Congress, then we, the Democrats, should suggest programs and they, the Republicans, should earnestly consider any such suggestions. The Democratic Congress has not been outstanding in this respect, nor has the administration exhibited great courage in recommending needed efforts.

DR. WITMAN: Our third speaker is the former executive secretary to Representatives Albert Austin and Clare Booth Luce, Connecticut's Republican Albert Morano. He was well-acquainted with Congress, in fact, when he won his own seat in 1950. During the 84th Congress he has already served as a one-man mission to study the economy of Cuba and is the first member of Congress to address a foreign legislature in its own tongue. He, too, is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee -- and will speak in English. Representative Morano!

REP. MORANO: The effectiveness of foreign policy leadership by this administration is shown clearly by the record President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles have established since they have come to office. Two years ago the bitter and inconclusive Korean War still dragged on -- a war the preceding administration was unwilling, really, to win and unable to end. As he promised to do, President Eisenhower personally went to Korea to explore means of restoring an honorable peace and then, with Secretary Dulles, planned a fresher, firmer course. The Communists were made to understand that if they failed soon to reach an agreement for a cease fire, they would

run the risk of retaliation massive enough to cause them far more than war could gain. Today, Korea is at peace.

Only a year ago, Chinese Communist claims to the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu were threatening again to plunge the world into a full-scale war. The President sought and obtained from Congress overwhelming assurance that the might of America would be used, if necessary, to guard the peace; and once again made it plain that force would meet aggressive force. As the preceding administration had failed in the case of Korea to do, no war has broken out on the Formosa Straits.

With the guidance and the tireless support of our Secretary of State, SEATO and the Baghdad Pact have been created, completing a world-wide warning system against aggression and a rearming Germany has joined with NATO, despite ten years of Soviet effort to prevent it. The granting of freedom to Austria, the pilgrimage to Belgrade and the agreement to hold the Summit meeting at Geneva were signs the Soviet leaders realized that continued threats and aggression were futile against Western unity and strength. President Eisenhower's words and actions at Geneva were symbols for all the world to see of America's continued determination to work for peace. A good general forces his opponent to meet him on ground that is favorable to him.

Our leadership is responsible, in large measure, for causing the Soviets to meet us now on ground that is primarily economic and political, rather than military. As a nation that has provided \$55 billion in foreign aid over the past ten years, as a nation whose 160 million people produce over three times what the Soviet's 220 million people produce, we are willing and we are able to meet the economic challenge. As a nation that was founded on freedom and not on tyranny, we share a common cause with other peoples who seek freedom and not tyranny. Our leaders have placed us on the high ground -- on the ground where we are the strongest -- in this latest stage in the contest for the world. If we continue to follow and support our leadership, we can feel confident indeed of the outcome.

DR. WITMAN: And now, Mr. Zablocki. Since the beginning of his career in the House in 1949, Wisconsin Democrat Clement Zablocki has been an active member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. At present, he chairs the subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific. Indeed, during the past year, Mr. Zablocki has led a special study mission from the House in a tour throughout the Near, Middle and Far East, Southeast Asia and the Pacific. Welcome home, Mr. Zablocki, and let's hear from you now.

REP. ZABLOCKI: At the outset I would like to state that I firmly believe in a bipartisan approach to our foreign policy. This belief, however, should not serve to silence the criticism which may be needed to point out the weaknesses of our foreign policy and thereby to further the remedy. The remarks which I shall make today are offered strictly in the spirit of constructive criticism. They are not intended as a partisan condemnation of the course which our nation has pursued in its foreign relations during the recent years.

Having made this reservation, I would like to underline my conviction that our foreign policy has lacked effective leadership and consistency during the last three years. Policy oscillations, retreat under pressure, and undue flexibility on other occasions all have contributed to make our foreign policy less effective than it could have been.

Dr. Witman, as you have stated, I have recently returned from a prolonged and arduous study mission to the Middle East, Southeast Asia and the Pacific. In the course of that mission, I had the opportunity to again survey and appraise the operations of our foreign policy in the critical areas of the world. I returned home with an impression that we have suffered major setbacks all along the line in the last two or three years. The administration's failure to outline and follow a positive consistent policy for the Middle East, Southeast Asia and the Pacific, and its entirely excessive reliance on military alliances have been of no help in solving the problems in the areas. On the contrary, these actions have stimulated the growth of a neutralist spirit in Southeast Asia and invited Communist economic and military penetration in that vital region. In my opinion, during the last three years, the free world,

unfortunately, under American leadership has failed -- has not only failed to contain the spread of communism and the Communist influence in power, but has actually lost in the critical race for the friendship and the loyalty of the underdeveloped countries of that region.

Among the specific examples of the ineffective leadership of our foreign policy was the loss of Northern Indochina and the indecisiveness which almost resulted in the writing off of South Vietnam. We must further mention the ill-timed and ill-fated Goa statement of Secretary Dulles which undermined our prestige in the Far East and left many nations -- including our very good friends in that area -- seriously concerned about our position versus colonialism in that area of the world. Neither can we neglect the most recent fiasco with respect to the shipment of the 18 light tanks to Saudi Arabia. This incident had a terrible effect on world opinion of our foreign policy. To some, it appeared that in the absence of our Secretary of State, foreign policy determinations of the United States were made a White House press secretary. The incident further showed that even though the shipment was licensed and cleared by the State Department months ago, nobody -- nobody -- apart, perhaps from Mr. Dulles, appeared to know anything about it.

These, and many other instances attest to the ineffective leadership which has been evident in the field of our foreign policy during the last three years.

DR. WITMAN: Thank you very much, gentlemen. Now, there you have it. You have four statements and four points of view and there is plenty of meat in these four positions to continue a discussion for a long, long time. Let us hear what each of these gentlemen has to say about the other's opening statement. We'll start with Mr. Vorys. Mr. Vorys, what do you think about your colleagues' comments?

REP. VORYS: I want to concur with what my friend, Mr. Williams, said -- that we mustn't play politics with foreign policy and that the Democrats, the opposition party, should do more than criticize, but must suggest alternatives. When we come to my good friend, Mr. Zablocki, who says our leadership has had major setbacks all along the line, has failed in the fight with communism and actually lost the race for the underdeveloped countries -- if he hadn't said that all this was bipartisan, I'd say that was a Democrat talking. Not one word of constructive criticism. Now as to a couple of points he made -- excessive reliance on military alliances -- in the last two years, fiscal year '55 and '56, the economic has exceeded the military authorizations and appropriations and it came right out of our committee and Mr. Zablocki and I joined in having economic exceed the military authorizations and appropriations. He said as an example of "our" lack of leadership, the loss of Indochina. He knows that we refused to join in the Geneva surrender. We offered, prior to that, military aid to save Dienbienphu if the United Kingdom would join. He knows that the United Kingdom indicated they would join but then backed down, and that was one of the cases where we were willing to go to the brink, as Mr. Dulles explained, but where we did not participate in the events that caused the loss of Indochina. One more! He mentioned the fiasco of the 18 light tanks to Saudi Arabia. He knows that those tanks were to protect American bases 1500 miles from Israel, where they would shake to pieces before they could go over the desert to get to Israel. Undersecretary Hoover held them up when responsible citizens protested, but when he found that everything was all right and in order, he let them go. Now, I want some constructive suggestions from my dear friend. What was wrong -- what was the fiasco about this? First, was the fiasco in agreeing last year to send tanks to protect these bases which are so important to our security? Two, was there anything wrong in double-checking this protest when it was made from American citizens? Was there anything wrong in when we found that the protest was not justified and that the whole thing was in order and we were carrying out a contract made long ago -- was there anything wrong in delivering the tanks as per agreement? I would be glad to have some constructive suggestions.

DR. WITMAN: Let's change the order now and go to Mr. Zablocki, because I think he has been the target of Mr. Vorys' observations, then we'll pick up you other two gentlemen in just a moment. Do you want to reply, Mr. Zablocki?

REP. ZABLOCKI: Thank you, Doctor, Yes. If my colleague, Mr. Vorys, intends to include defense support in our economic authorization and appropriation, I would say then that is true. But defense support is the major portion of our military authorization-appropriation. I believe that I would like to answer the last fiasco of the 18 tanks at this time and if the fiasco was the agreement to sell 18 tanks to Saudi Arabia -- I would say No, that was not it. Neither was it double-checking. Nor after checking did I mean to imply the sending of 18 tanks was a fiasco. But who had stopped these tanks after they were negotiated -- after the agreement was made -- after they were sold -- why were they stopped in the Eleventh Hour before being sent? Only because certain pressures were made upon our State Department and there was concern, there was chaos. Some of the members of the State Department didn't even know that there was such an agreement and negotiation between Saudi Arabia and the United States. And the very fact that the shipment that was negotiated -- and it was a rightful shipment -- to Saudi Arabia was stopped, has caused grave concern and had great repercussions among the nations, among the Arabian countries in the Middle East. I think it was an unfortunate situation. If we had made an arrangement to sell tanks to Saudi Arabia, there was no reason why the State Department should have become so deeply concerned to stop shipment.

DR. WITMAN: Mr. Williams, do you want to comment?

REP. WILLIAMS: Thank you. As my friend, John Vorys, levelled at Mr. Zablocki, I think it was a good idea, to let him come in at this point. I think that I detect in the statements of the Republican members here this evening, particularly in the statement of my friend, Mr. Morano, the attitude that I think can do us great danger this year -- a very important year. We are now into a Presidential election year and if either side is to make highly partisan statements in foreign policy and the foreign policy field, I think we're going to run the risk of national division that we can't have. I saw that particularly, as I say, in Mr. Morano's statement, -- undue partisanship. It seems to me that we can't blink the fact that throughout the world there are grave problems and it doesn't help to solve those problems, to have our country sloganized by phrases that mean very little. It seems to me that this is an opportunity that the American people have a right to expect that, particularly those of us in public life, will stand on a responsible position of analyzing the issues and not sloganizing the country. Therefore, I hope that before this evening is over that we do face up to the problem in the Middle East where I don't believe you can escape the fact that there isn't a firm, reliable policy.

DR. WITMAN: Let's hear what Mr. Morano has to say.

REP. MORANO: First of all, if Mr. Williams accuses me of being partisan, he is absolutely right. I am partisan and the reason that I am getting partisan in this debate is because the Democrats have been, of late, very vociferous in stating and challenging the Republican party to debate the foreign policy of the United States. If the Democrats would be willing to desist from doing that, and follow the Eisenhower Administration, I'm sure that we would discontinue this issue in the next election. You brought up this Middle East question and I want to say something about the Middle East. First of all, I am one of those who favors sending arms to Israel. The administration differs somewhat from my views and they have perfectly good reasons to differ. They have never said that they would not send arms to Israel. There is an application pending before the administration and that application is being studied and the application has never been denied. If the measures that the administration is planning on taking before deciding to send arms do not work, the idea that arms may be sent is not foreclosed. Another thing -- certainly the United States helped to create the country of Israel and I am certain that we, the United States, are going to do everything we can to preserve, to protect and to perpetuate the Republic of Israel.

REP. WILLIAMS: Could I interrupt at that point, Mr. Moderator?

DR. WITMAN: Yes, please do.

REP. WILLIAMS: When?

DR. WITMAN: A short interruption.

REP. MORANO: It's very simple. First of all, Israel has not been attacked and if any aggressor in that area attacks Israel, the full force of the United States, I am certain, will be brought to bear to stop an aggressor.

DR. WITMAN: Now I want to interrupt myself. I am fascinated by this discussion, gentlemen, and I think we are doing a very sound thing in analyzing the relative merits of American foreign policy, but I also want to draw to your attention that our subject is, "DO WE HAVE EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP IN FOREIGN POLICY," and this involves questions of where does that leadership lie, where should it lie and I think we need to address ourselves directly to whether the leadership is effective -- not whether it is getting good results in policy.

REP. MORANO: Mr. Moderator, may I say something about the leadership? I am one of those who firmly believe, with all the vigor of my being, that if there is one man in this world who can find the difficult road to a sound and a durable peace, that man is President Eisenhower and he is the man that leads the foreign policy of this country.

REP. ZABLOCKI: Dr. Witman, I am very glad you brought us back on the track by asking what is the leadership of our foreign policy. Both of my colleagues, the Republican colleagues, Congressman Vorys and Congressman Morano, have brought to our attention some of the accomplishments. Particularly, Dr. Witman, Mr. Vorys stated that in Europe, Germany has joined NATO and Austria has gained its independence and the Western European Union was formed -- all of these foreign policies were begun, initiated by the Democratic Administration. However, since then we should also note that plans for political and economic unity of Western Europe have failed to advance and even slipped back during the last three years. Further, from a military viewpoint, the lack of effect from a French and German participation has weakened our mutual defenses. As far as SEATO -- Mr. Vorys, you mentioned SEATO -- and I am perfectly in accord. As you recall, in 1949 it was our committee who had suggested a mutual pact -- a Pacific Pact -- and began the idea of SEATO.

REP. VORYS: But it was this administration that put it into effect.

DR. WITMAN: I want to ask this question, Mr. Zablocki. Does this mean that you are arguing that the leadership for foreign policy should come from Congressional committees?

REP. ZABLOCKI: Not at all, not at all. The Congressional committees may assist, they implement, they advise -- if they are ever invited to give their advice and I might say that particularly our Foreign Affairs Committee of the House is deeply hurt because this administration treats us somewhat like an illegitimate child. Our advice is not sought -- we're not even told.

REP. MORANO: That's not quite so. I think this administration has kept the House Foreign Affairs Committee completely informed on everything it is doing and in plenty of time ahead of decision. I want to say something about this Democratic controlled Congress. The Democratic controlled Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Democratic controlled Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, if they desired to, could pass a resolution any day and every day expressing exactly what they would intend to do if they were at the head of the government and they've never done anything like that. I agree with my colleague, Mr. Vorys, the distinguished representative from Ohio, that they have never come up with a constructive criticism yet in this administration.

DR. WITMAN: We quite obviously need some leadership right here tonight, so we're going to have to assert that leadership. We've heard from Mr. Morano, now we'll hear from Mr. Vorys.

REP. VORYS: I just said Mr. Zablocki didn't come up with constructive statements on his opening statement. On this matter of Western European Union, it was a policy carried out by the administration leadership, based on an amendment by the chairman of our committee, Mr. Richards, when the Republicans controlled Congress that had a great deal to do. It was an "or else" amendment. If you don't, you nations that have agreed to EDC, to some sort of Western European Union, if you don't ratify that agree-

ment, you don't get any more stuff from the U.S.A. And it was the implementation of that amendment by our Secretary of State and our Executive branch that had a great deal to do with the bringing into being of Western European Union.

REP. ZABLOCKI: Sponsored and introduced by a Democrat.

REP. VORYS: The amendment was, that's correct and I paid my respects to Mr. Richards in my opening statement. I say we're blessed that we have such a team in operation right now and when it comes to SEATO it's true that our committee, while the Democratic Administration was in power, back in 1949, first suggested of any official body in government that we ought to have a Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, but it took this administration to put the thing into effect and to make it a living, going concern, as Mr. Dulles did in the past few weeks when he's been down there. It was the Northern Tier, the concept of having the states along the southern border of Russia, Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, Turkey, of having them get together and not trying the impossible task of having the Arab states have a METO -- the Middle East defense organization which was the....

REP. ZABLOCKI: Using the Baghdad Pact.....

DR. WITMAN: Wait a minute! Mr. Williams has been very silent here. I want to give him a chance.

REP. WILLIAMS: Getting back to our subject, DO WE HAVE EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP, it seems to me that the answer to that must be found by analyzing the problems that we are confronted with throughout the world, and analyzing the policies designed to meet these grave situation. Go back to NATO -- I don't believe you can escape from a conclusion that this is the most important grouping of free nations there is, and yet it is deteriorating. What are we doing? I see no sign of effectively implementing the NATO grouping to meet its present challenge and the challenge, of course, is that the member nations are losing interest in a purely military alliance. I see no efforts to bolster that grouping of nations.

REP. MORANO: I have a different point of view than you do. I think that NATO, instead of deteriorating, is getting stronger.

REP. WILLIAMS: Did you hear General Gruenther just a month ago when he was here? He told us and, of course, he should know.

REP. MORANO: Well, the generals always say they need more and more and more, but the fact remains that the General also said that the defense posture in Europe is strong and is good and it's getting stronger. As a matter of fact, you know that the German units are being rearmed and ready to enter NATO.

REP. WILLIAMS: You heard President Gronchi the other day when he spoke to the joint session of Congress. He expressed the fear that the alliance was not obviously meeting the challenge.

REP. MORANO: Obviously, President Gronchi would like to have measures other than military to bring about peace in the world, but that just can't be. When you're in a defensive position, you've got to build up your military forces.

REP. WILLIAMS: You've got to do more.

REP. MORANO: While you're doing that, you can do more and this administration is doing more. We are meeting the Russian challenge of economic penetration of the free world by counter measures and one of them is the plan to build the Aswan Dam. We won, I think, the Egyptians away from the Russians on that deal because the World Bank has now signed an agreement.

REP. WILLIAMS: Of course, the Egyptians now have purchased arms from a Soviet satellite since negotiations began. Don't you feel that Soviet penetration in the Middle East is a new and dangerous thing?

DR. WITMAN: We've been talking again, I think, to such questions as the validity of our foreign policy; who is responsible for making that foreign policy as between the two parties, perhaps rather more than we have been discussing it in relationship to the executive, the legislative, and other things. I happen to recall, and I also glance over some papers not long ago, have been looking at news and radio commentaries about this whole matter, and here are some of the things I came up with, having read and heard

as charges in regard to this matter. One is, that there is too much alteration of policy -- that there is not a consistency of policy. Another is that our Secretary of State is absent too often, he's away from the country. Another is the matter of the apparent fluctuation in decision which has been taken from time to time. Another has been the shift in Soviet strategy. How do we take care of this shift in Soviet strategy? Have we reacted to it? Another was the fact that Foreign Minister of France Pineau's speech was critical of American policy. I don't believe these things, or I don't oppose or accept them. I'm laying them out as matters which have come across my vision as questions which are before the American people. Now, you can ponder these questions which I have raised and get your answers in focus, but let us turn our attention to our prize-winning question. This week's winner of the American Peoples Encyclopedia is William E. Nichols of Oshkosh, Wisconsin, and this is his question: "What should be the criteria for evaluating a foreign policy being pursued by any administration?" He apparently wants to get you off the Republican and Democratic crux. First, Mr. Morano.

REP. MORANO: I believe that evaluation should be based on (a) do we have peace in the world, and (b), do we have trade in the world.

REP. VORYS: The welfare and security of the nation is the criteria and, therefore, if you have peace and prosperity, it means you have a pretty good foreign policy in operation.

REP. ZABLOCKI: I would take the criterion to be, do we have an understanding of the peoples of the world and a cooperation of the peoples of the world which would lead to peace.

REP. WILLIAMS: It seems to me that the question should be, "Are our policies meeting our needs," and our needs, I suppose, are to be found in living in a world that is moving towards greater freedom and a durable and lasting peace.

DR. WITMAN: I am tempted to ask, are there Republican needs and Democratic needs, but I'm not going to ask that. Let's go on to questions from our audience. I think we ought to start out with an old friend of Town Hall audiences. You have heard him on the air, Mr. James Wick, who is editor and publisher of the journal "Human Events." Jim Wick!

MR. WICK: Mr. Williams, do you believe that Congress should appropriate about \$5 billion a year for foreign aid for many years to come?

REP. WILLIAMS: It is hard to put the level on our economic aid programs for a long period. I am certainly committed to the proposition that we will probably find that we have to be engaged in economic aid to underdeveloped areas for a long period. I think that's just about the way the President put it, and I'm in agreement. As far as levels are concerned, I think it is a little early to say just how much we will have to spend.

QUESTIONER: Congressman Vorys, in your opening statement you remarked that our diplomats have great ability and training. If this ability and training is so great, why are there incidents like the Goa statement by Secretary of State Dulles?

REP. VORYS: The Goa statement has been commented on by Mr. Zablocki and it is made out by certain people that it offended India. I don't know what could make India any more unfriendly than she has been acting recently. Mr. Dulles called attention to the people of India when he was there, and had a very friendly visit with Nehru the other day that in his statement he did not propose any solution and did not attempt to dictate a solution. But it seems to me that India, which blows hot and cold and acts one way on colonialism and on peace when it is outside of her borders, and another way when its territories that border her, like Kashmir, that it's a good thing to have India told the facts of international life from time to time.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Morano, you disputed the contention of Mr. Williams that there was growing dissension among the powers who make up the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I want to ask you, Sir, if it's really your view that our leadership in foreign policy can be effective if we don't proceed somewhat along the lines laid down in the Kefauver resolution which has been before Congress several months and

which calls for an exploratory convention of delegates from leading member countries of NATO, designed to promote much closer unity between the Atlantic democracies than we have yet been able to get?

DR. WITMAN: I wonder if I have that question correctly, which is, does Mr. Morano approve the idea of a convention of the leading countries in the NATO organization.

REP. MORANO: First of all, Mr. Williams didn't say there was dissention between the NATO countries. I don't think I heard him say that.

REP. WILLIAMS: I said the alliance was deteriorating.

REP. MORANO: I don't know what you mean by that, but you didn't say there was dissention between members of the alliance. In any case, I don't think there is any need for a meeting of delegates, such as you say. They have a council of NATO, representing every one of the countries and each one has a member on it and that's sufficient, in my opinion, to discharge all the duties and responsibilities of NATO.

REP. VORYS: I'd like to comment on that. I'm quite familiar with the Kefauver resolution, exploratory resolution, to which the gentleman refers. It's a proposal by the Union Now and Union and Freedom group, led largely by my good friend, Clarence Streit, with whom I happen to disagree, on this proposition. This proposes that we explore an attempt to move closer for a union between the United States and these European countries. I think what Europe needs is what Congress, with a bipartisan majority year after year in our committee and otherwise, has been urging upon Europe, and that is that they get together themselves over there and unite and federate. That is their salvation and their only salvation in peace or war and they better do it and not expect us to come over and join them in doing it. They better follow our example and as we have a United States of North America, they better have a United States of Europe. That would be my answer.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Zablocki, do you believe that intensifying party responsibility on the order of the British system would provide more effective leadership in foreign policy?

REP. ZABLOCKI: Yes, I do.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Vorys, will the visit of Khrushchev and Bulganin to Britain embarrass our government and force the administration to invite them to visit this country?

REP. VORYS: It wouldn't embarrass me to do it and I think Khrushchev and Bulganin hinted around for an invitation at a cocktail party over there in Moscow when they were meeting with some Scandinavians recently. I hope we don't take the hint. I think the visit is going to be embarrassing enough to our friends, the British. We better not have them over here yet.

REP. ZABLOCKI: Dr. Witman, may I become just a little bit political?

DR. WITMAN: Go right ahead -- new developments.

REP. ZABLOCKI: If there is going to be an invitation, I hope it is now.

REP. VORYS: I might comment further. I was not in favor of our President going to the Summit meeting. He did pretty well when he got there but as far as invitations are concerned, when President Truman said to Uncle Joe after he made one mistake, he said, "If Stalin wants to see me, tell him to come over here." I think he had something there.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Williams, what degree of leadership in foreign policy is left to the inter-governmental agencies, such as the National Security Council?

REP. WILLIAMS: Of course, the various agencies and Cabinet members certainly contribute, I am sure, their thinking but the responsibility, of course, rests on the President. I frankly don't know how much they do. They are, I hope, in constant thought and communication with the President on the problems. Of course, his is the responsibility ultimately for the decision and for the policy.

DR. WITMAN: I wonder if I can pursue that a step further? I wonder if any of these gentlemen on the panel would care to comment on this kind of question: Where should we look for effective leadership in foreign policy in this country? We've been trying all evening to work around this question of do we have it. Since we haven't been able to get very far on that, where should we look for it? The gentleman in the audience has suggested that it might be in the National Security Council. Mr. Williams has said it will ultimately rest on the President. Are there any other places? Mr. Morano?

REP. MORANO: Of course, with the Secretary of State and with the chairman and members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and with the chairman and members of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. And, of course, the President. Every time there is a matter of foreign policy which involves our national security, certainly he discusses it at great length with the National Security Council. I don't know to what extent they influence him or to what extent they advise him, but certainly he does advise and consult with them and bases his decision, I presume, on any advice they may give him.

REP. ZABLOCKI: We have had for consideration a suggestion that a non-partisan Senate and House and membership by a public body of a commission to advise the President should be formed to assist the President in formulating foreign policy. However, I think that the National Security Council was created for just that purpose and I think that the assistance the President needs should lie within the National Security Council.

DR. WITMAN: But do you all agree it should rest with the President, or should it rest with the Secretary of State?

REP. VORYS: The Constitution gives the President responsibilities he cannot avoid, evade or delegate.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Morano, don't you think that by its lack of positive policy in dealing with the Cyprus and North African problem, all of which are weakening our collective security program, the administration is showing a lack of effective leadership?

REP. MORANO: No, I don't. First of all, I introduced the resolution on Cyprus, I want you to know. And if this Democratic controlled Committee on Foreign Affairs would report my resolution, we would be on our way to getting a solution to the Cyprus question.

REP. WILLIAMS: May I interrupt? Did you get a favorable report from the Department of State?

REP. MORANO: It makes no difference whether I got a favorable or an unfavorable report. If you Democrats -- as I have been saying all night -- would like to clearly express your views on how you feel about any question, including the Middle East and Cyprus, you could pass out some resolutions.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Zablocki, aside from the political aspect of foreign leadership, do we have qualified personnel working in our State Department Foreign Offices?

REP. ZABLOCKI: In all sincerity, I must say we have some very adequate and very capable people in the foreign offices. However, I think it can very well be improved and I would like, at this time, to put in a little plug for a piece of legislation that I have been sponsoring for many, many years, ever since I've been in Congress -- and that is a Foreign Service Academy to better our foreign service.

QUESTIONER: Mr. James F. Byrnes recently wrote an article in a national magazine making suggestions for improving foreign service. Have people like this been convinced by Congress....

MR. ZABLOCKI: It is my understanding that Secretary Henderson has tried to get all of the possible assist that he need have in bettering our foreign service. More power to him.

DR. WITMAN: Will each of you people answer a question from me very quickly? Will you agree to answer very quickly if I put it to you? Each of you have a chance to have a last word on the air. You only have ten seconds in which to do it. I want to ask Mr. Vorys first, and down the line. Do we have effective leadership in foreign policy?

REP. MORANO: Yes!

REP. ZABLOCKI: I don't think so.

REP. VORYS: Yes, I haven't heard anybody suggest any better leadership.

REP. WILLIAMS: I think it could be much more effective.

REP. MORANO: Certainly we don't want to return to the Truman-Acheson fumbling failures.

REP. ZABLOCKI: Have we got 10 seconds? If we have 10 seconds I would like to enlighten Mr. Morano as to the type of foreign policy leadership we have. And it's a quote from today's news conference of the President on Cyprus, "So we are ready to do anything that is reasonable and practicable to help in reaching some solution, but the solution itself is going to have to be reached by the people most gravely concerned."

DR. WITMAN: Representative Morano, Representative Zablocki, Representative Vorys and Representative Williams, thank you very, very much, indeed, and also members of this Washington audience.

"TOWN MEETING: A 20-YEAR CAVALCADE"



THE FAMOUS 'TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR' TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY BROADCAST

with Narration by John Daly

An exciting, historically important 12", 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ rpm,
long-playing record

Retail Price \$4.98

At your record dealer—or send check or money order to:

TOWN HALL, INC.

123 West 43rd St.

New York 36, N. Y.